

REMARKS

The Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview which was fruitful in discussing the disclosures of the prior art references. The arguments presented below are in accord with the discussion at the interview.

The Amendments

As discussed at the interview, claim 1 is amended by incorporating into it the elements of claims 2 to 5, which claims are cancelled. Additionally, a new independent claim is presented, which was also discussed at the interview, which recites the elements of former claim 1 in combination with the elements of former claims 4 and 5.

The Rejection Under 35 USC § 103

The Office Action alleges that claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, and 16-21 are obvious over Glausch in view of Schauer and that claims 1, 4-7 and 15 are obvious over Winter in view of Glausch.

All the previous arguments provided in the last two replies are incorporated herein by reference.

Applicants in the interview argued that Winter is directed to an invention that provides nothing relevant to the present case. Winter is directed to UV absorbers of formula I, which can be used in various applications, e.g., polymer films, which can contain a very large number of ingredients including pigments, primers, binders, stabilizers, polymers, etc. See, e.g., column 4, lines 41-58. Huge lists of more specific ingredients are disclosed on columns 6 to 14. No specific pigments are described at all. And no treatment or coating of any pigments is disclosed. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found any reason to take any part of the disclosure of Winter and apply it to the present invention in combination with any other art.

Regarding Glausch and Schauer, both references teach completely different types of pigments and completely different types of coatings and different types of interactions (enveloping or binding) of said coatings with the pigments with no apparent or apparent interchangeability of either the pigments or the coating thereon or the interactions of said coating with the pigments. There is no overlap in either one of these features. Merely, the broad art can be described as coatings on pigments without any regard to the details of the

pigments, coatings, etc.

Nothing in either reference teaches or suggests that the pigment types of these references are interchangeable, or that the coating types of these references are interchangeable, or that the interactions of the coatings with the pigments are interchangeable.

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have a reason to combine the teachings of these references, and by chance, if and when combined, there is no guidance toward the selection of the elements of the claimed invention from among the many options, e.g., including the elements formerly recited in claims 2-5.

Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969
Attorneys for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, VA 22201
Telephone: 703-243-6333
Facsimile: 703-243-6410
Attorney Docket No.:MERCK-2981

Date: November 19, 2008
K:\Merck\2000 - 2999\2981\Reply Nov 08.doc